

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 to 20, 22 to 25, 27 to 32, 34 and 35 are pending in this application of which claims 1, 10, 18, 25 and 32 are the independent claims. Claims 2, 21, 26 and 33 are cancelled without prejudice. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants held a teleconference with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor to discuss the advisory action (mailed September 12, 2007) and argued that a non final office action should be issued. Applicants respectfully pointed out that the Examiner made statements in the final office action (mailed June 22, 2007) that Ohta teaches a cipher core as the Encryption and Authentication Processing Control Unit 301 in FIG. 12. After Applicants argued that the Encryption and Authentication Processing Control Unit 301 was not a cipher core, the Examiner changed her mind and said that the cipher core was encryption units 303a and 303b in the advisory action. The Examiner's supervisor initially agreed that a non final office action should be issued. However, an hour later the Examiner's supervisor withdrew his statements citing In re Kronig 539 F. 2d 1300, 1302-03 further stating that the thrust of the Ohta reference is correct. Applicants respectfully pointed out that In re Kronig was not on point having nothing to do with an Examiner misleading an Applicant but rather on reducing the number of references to maintain a rejection. Applicants stated that by directing Applicants to focus on a different part of Ohta Applicants' time and money has been wasted.

Claims 3 to 5, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for allegedly being indefinite because “processing contexts” lacked antecedent basis. Based on the foregoing claim amendments the rejections to claims 3 to 5 and 23 are now moot. Claim 25 does not contain the term “processing contexts” and therefore Applicants conclude that the §112 rejection of claim 25 is in error. Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §112 rejection.

Claims 1 to 6 and 8 to 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ohta et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0083317 hereinafter “Ohta”) in view of Tardo et al. (U.S. Patent Number 7,082,534). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ohta in view of Tardo and in view of Corder et al. (U.S. Patent Number 7,069,447)

Claim 1 is directed to a processor. The processor includes a crypto unit including a cipher core configured to cipher data received, authentication cores configured to authenticate the ciphered data and processing contexts each configured to process at least one data packet at a time and to store cipher keys and algorithm context associated processing the at least one data packet. At least two authentication cores each implements a different authentication algorithm. The processor also includes an authentication buffer configured to store the ciphered data and provide the ciphered data to the authentication cores each in an amount based on the corresponding authentication algorithm implemented. The authentication buffer includes a number of buffer elements corresponding to a number of processing contexts.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. In particular, the Ohta reference does not disclose or suggest processing contexts, each configured to process at least one data packet at a time and to store cipher keys and algorithm context associated with processing the at least one data packet much less that the authentication buffer includes a number of buffer elements corresponding to a number of processing contexts (see, for example, FIG. 2 and page 5, lines 4 to 22 of Applicants' specification).

The Examiner has indicated that Fig. 12 shows a corresponding number of data block accumulation units to encryption processing units (see page 4 of the Final Office Action). However, Applicants respectfully point out that even going back to the original claims Applicants have recited processing contexts separate from a cipher core. Furthermore, Ohta does not teach that each processing context is configured to process at least one data packet at a time and to store cipher keys and algorithm context associated with processing the at least one data packet. Therefore, Ohta does not disclose or suggest processing contexts, each configured to process at least one data packet at a time and to store cipher keys and algorithm context associated processing the at least one data packet much less that the authentication buffer includes a number of buffer elements corresponding to a number of processing contexts.

Independent claims 10, 18, 20, 25 and 32 include corresponding features to claim 1. Applicants submit that the Ohta reference should also be withdrawn with respect to claims 18, 25 and 32 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the art rejections.

Applicants submit that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for withdrawing the prior art cited with regards to any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

All correspondence should be directed to the address below. Applicants' attorney can be reached by telephone at (781) 401-9988 ext. 123.


Enclosed is an electronic fee for the One-Month Extension of Time. No other fee is believed to be due for this Response; however, if any other fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0845 referencing Attorney Docket: INTEL-013PUS.

Applicants : Sydir et al.
Serial No. : 10/749,913
Filed : December 29, 2003
Page : 17 of 17

Attorney's Docket No.: INTEL-013PUS
Intel Docket No. P17940

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 26 October 2007



Anthony T. Moosey
Reg. No. 55,773

Attorneys for Intel Corporation
Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Telephone: (781) 401-9988 ext. 123
Facsimile: (781) 401-9966